

The Regular Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chairman Littman at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, March 12, 2002, in the Council Chambers of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Reece  
Storrs  
Littman  
Waller  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Starr  
Wright

**Absent**

Chamberlain

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

RESOLUTION

Moved by Wright

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that Mr. Chamberlain be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yeas:

All Present (8)

Absent:

Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments

3. MINUTES – January 22, 2002

RESOLUTION

Moved by Reese

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED to approve the January 22, 2002 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes as corrected.

Yeas:

Storrs  
Pennington  
Littman  
Starr  
Waller  
Wright  
Reece

Abstain

Kramer

Absent

Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

**TABLED ITEMS**

4. PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD-1) – Proposed Troy Baptist Church/Robertson Brothers P.U.D., East side of Rochester and South of South Blvd., Section 2 – R-1D – Tabling Requested by Petitioner

The petitioner submitted a request to table the PUD proposal (enclosed).

Mr. Littman asked if there was any indication from the petitioner as to when they would be ready to appear.

Mr. Miller stated I believe they want to go forward as soon as possible. It seems they will be proposing a different configuration of the residential area. It may or may not be under a PUD.

Mr. Miller further stated that the Chairman, Mr. Chamberlain, wanted this item on the agenda for the next study session and to meet at the site at 6:00 p.m.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Waller

Seconded by Starr

RESOLVED, that the Proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD-1) – Proposed Troy Baptist Church/Robertson Brothers P.U.D., East side of Rochester and South of South Blvd., Section 2 – R-1D, is hereby tabled to the next regular meeting which will be held on April 9, 2002. However, this item will be discussed at the next Study Session.

Yeas:

All present (8)

Nays:

Absent:

Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

## SITE PLANS

5. SITE PLAN REVIEW – Proposed Huntington Estates Site Condominium, South of Wattles, East of Fernleigh, Section 24, R-1C

Mr. Miller stated that Joe Maniaci of Wattles Woods L.L.C., submitted a Site Plan for 3.92 acres of land within the R-1C zoning District. Subject property is proposed to be split from an existing single family acreage parcel fronting Fernleigh Street. A single road is proposed with 9 units utilizing the average lot size provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. The road system will connect to the existing stub of Springtime Drive from the Glenwood Park Subdivision. This single road terminates with a cul-de-sac and includes a future street easement to the south to allow inter-connection with adjacent properties to the south. The developer included a schematic proposal for the future development of the adjacent properties. Due to the Shanahan Drain north of the subject property, future interconnection is not included on the schematic future development plans.

Mr. Miller further stated that a stormwater detention basin is located in the northeast corner of the site condominium. This stormwater detention facility is designed with access to the proposed extension of Springtime Drive and will be designed with a shallow slope. The City will accept ownership of the detention basin after it's constructed to City Development Standards.

Mr. Miller further stated that there appears to be a MDEQ regulated wetlands located in the southeast corner of the proposed site condominium. A wetlands delineation is provided by the petitioner and the wetlands are documented on the proposed Site Plan. King & MacGregor Inc. prepared the delineation for the

petitioner (enclosed). The City's wetlands consultant is waiting for acceptable conditions to inspect the subject property to confirm the wetlands indicated by the petitioner. A wetlands permit will be required to fill the wetlands as indicated on the Site Plan. The remaining wetlands and the proposed mitigated wetland area will be located within a private park area.

Mr. Miller further stated that the proposed Site Plan adheres to all Zoning Ordinance requirements. The Planning Department recommends approval of the proposed nine (9) unit site condominium development, contingent upon City verification of the wetlands.

Mr. Miller concluded stating that since writing the agenda packet for this evening's meeting, Troy City Department heads met and discussed this case. It was indicated at their meeting that the use of a street easement would not be wise. They stated that if it was converted to a road in the future, it would cause some disgruntled residents. They suggested that the road be installed as part of the development. The City employees discussed possible interconnection and noted it might be wise to access any new development from Fernleigh Street. The petitioner prefers to have the cul-de-sac only, but is also willing to install a road for future development if necessary.

Mr. Miller stated that any new development is going to have acquired houses that front Ferleigh Street.

Mr. Waller asked about wetlands determination and the consultants. If there is a difference in the opinion of the MDEQ and the city consultants, what will be done to resolve the differences.

Mr. Miller stated that we would have to look at the scope of differences. However, the MDEQ is the ultimate authority.

Mr. Waller then asked what is the advantage for the City looking at the wetlands.

Mr. Miller stated it is the City's way of insuring that the developer does get the necessary permit from the MDEQ in the future.

Mr. Waller stated we are looking at a considerable expense and the possibility of a private park. Is City staff going to make up their mind before the developer goes for approval.

Mr. Miller stated that from a standpoint of interconnection with this subdivision, it may not be necessary. Interconnection could be off Fernleigh Street. The Planning Department needs input as to how they feel about interconnection. There are no clear cut answers. The City's opinion is that new development south of the subject property could have sufficient access off Fernleigh Street.

Mr. Kramer stated that one of the benefits of the connections to the south would be possible access if some development did occur.

Mr. Littman stated that the Fire Department may want the access off of Fernleigh for the safety of the people. It is an awfully small piece of wetlands, why is an MDEQ permit required.

Mr. Miller stated because it is within 500 feet of the Shanahan Drain and that is why it is regulated by the MDEQ.

Joe Maniaci, petitioner, stated it is a waste of concrete to provide road stub to the south.

Mr. Kramer asked if it would be a full 60 foot easement for the road.

Mr. Maniaci replied yes.

Dan Muzljakovich, 3643 Euclid Drive, stated he attended Wetlands Ordinance public hearings and a map of the wetlands was provided. His question is how can a road be put in a wetland. He is concerned about the increase in traffic flow off Euclid.

Mr. Littman stated that this is not where the development is going. They have delineated the wetland area. This area is the only area the MDEQ is concerned about. The land can be wet, but that does not mean it is a wetland.

Mr. Muzljakovich stated there are rules to determine wetland.

Mr. Storrs asked Mr. Muzljakovich which one is your house.

Mr. Muzljakovich replied he was the third house.

Mr. Storrs stated if there is wetlands on the development site, why put a street in there if it just leads to wetlands.

Mr. Littman asked, do we put an easement there or do we require the developer to construct the actual road.

Mr. Muzljakovich stated it is the only place that doesn't have standing water.

Mr. Miller stated it is very unfortunate that the stub street comes out where the wetlands are. MDEQ regulated wetlands can be filled if a permit is granted.

Karin Richner, 3671 Euclid, stated she lives on the corner of Springtime and asked if these were to be attached condominiums.

Mr. Littman stated that these will be site condominiums. It is a technique that the state has allowed. They would be single family homes.

Mr. Maniaci stated that said property was a farm and could be exempt from wetland regulations. Regarding the road, according to his expert, it would be west of the existing wetlands, moving it further away from the property. When they designated this area as a wetlands, it was probably just a generalized area.

Ms. Pennington asked in regards to this future street, what exactly does the developer want to do.

Mr. Miller stated if there was going to be interconnection, the road would be dedicated to the City. Further, there should be no question that a road will be there. The Springtime stub street has been there for a few years. We have cases of stub streets that allow development of the large pieces of property. It becomes a balance. He stated the smaller pieces of property become a little more difficult of how and when you do provide stub streets. The Fernleigh Street could remain as large lot homes.

Ms. Pennington asked if we can stipulate putting a drive in there somewhere.

Mr. Miller stated that's the City's concern with the easement. A developer could use the easement in the future. Is that fair for the future residents of this proposed development that their private park will include a road area.

Mr. Wright stated that if we want the easement for the road and if someone in the future develops to the south, would it be the future developer who installs the road.

Mr. Miller stated it would be the developer, but within City standards.

Mr. Starr asked about potential wetlands south of the subject property.

Mr. Miller stated that unfortunately we don't know specifically. We know that generally it has the potential for wetlands in that area.

Mr. Storrs stated that the MDEQ is not going to assess the property to the south.

Mr. Reece stated that he is concerned that there should be a connection. If it is impractical to put in the stub street there, I am in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Starr stated if there is no wetlands on the property to the south it does not have to come back because nothing will ever be developed. If there is a chance there will be development, then he wanted a stub street.

Mr. Reece commented on the lots west of Fernleigh Street.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Kramer

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that the Preliminary Plan as submitted under Section 34.30.00 of the Zoning Ordinance (Unplatted One-Family Residential Development) for the development of a One-Family Residential Site Condominium, known as Huntington Estates Site Condominium, 3.93 acres, nine (9) units, located south of Wattles and east of Fernleigh, Section 24 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. A 60 foot wide easement be part of the development as indicated on the site plan and shown on all plans and literature relative to this site condominium.
2. If the MDEQ evaluation of that area states that the stub street would not be practical, this would come back to the Planning Commission for review.

Yeas:

Kramer  
Pennington  
Wright  
Storrs  
Littman  
Waller

Nays:

Starr  
Reece

Absent:

Chamberlain

## MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Starr stated he was not comfortable with an easement.

Mr. Reece agreed.

6. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-873) – Robbins Park Office Center, South of Maple, East of Stephenson Hwy., Section 35, R-C

Mr. Miller stated that Lonnie Zimmerman submitted a Site Plan on behalf of EA & S Investments #4-Land, LLC, for the Robbins Park Office Center. The subject property is 2.5 acres and part of Lot 11 of Robbins Executive Park West No. 4 Subdivision, within the R-C Zoning District. Access to the proposed office building is from the existing private drive for Robbins Executive Park, via a single

driveway. The proposed building is 43,516 square feet in size and three stories, with a height of 40 feet. Stormwater detention is provided in existing facilities within the subdivision.

Mr. Miller further stated that the Natural Features Map indicates that there are no natural features on the subject property, however, the 100 flood plain will have to be verified prior to Final Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Miller further stated that Section 31.30.00 (L) of the Zoning Ordinance requires a 50 feet front yard abutting I75 freeway. The Planning Commission may permit reduction of the setback to twenty (20) feet when additional landscaped open areas are provided. In addition the Planning Commission shall determine that the nature and orientation of the subject building is such that screening through the use of a fully landscaped yard is not necessary, and that a serious development constraint would be created as a result of the standard landscaped yard requirement. A total of 20,100 square feet of landscaped open space is proposed. The abutting office buildings have the reduced setback of 20 feet, and increased landscaped open space areas.

Mr. Miller further stated that the subject property appears to be used as overflow parking for On-Star's office building and perhaps other buildings. The Planning Department is concerned that when the subject property is developed, On-Star's overflow parking will be a problem. The petitioner's representative is not aware of the current parking situation. The Planning Department recognizes that the proposed Site Plan includes three (3) extra parking spaces, however, there is concern for the excess parking demand in the surrounding office buildings. Additional research and field work by the Planning Department verified that the subject property is off-site parking.

Mr. Miller stated that the proposed Site Plan meets all Zoning Ordinance requirements, with due consideration of the Section 31.30.00 (L) for the reduction of front yard setback along I75. Approval of the Site Plan is recommended by the Planning Department.

Mr. Littman asked if it is zoned R-C shouldn't it have R-C parking requirements.

Mr. Miller stated office parking requirements include medical office and is one space per 100 square feet of floor area. Offices of engineering and architect, including drafting, is one space per 125 square feet of floor. For a general office, the requirement is one space per 200 square feet of floor area.

Ms. Pennington asked if it is our concern about what On Star is doing.

Mr. Miller stated that the subject property is not a designated parking area.



Mr. Storrs asked how much additional landscaping do they have to add. It looks like three percent.

Mr. Miller agreed.

Mr. Kramer asked if there is a specific parking requirement for R-C or does it fall under general office.

Mr. Miller stated general office.

Mr. Zimmerman, petitioner, stated that Mr. Miller did a thorough job in his presentation. He did state that the owner's management company has a contract with Maple Park Office shuttle because of their shortage of parking. However, there is no long term commitment.

Mr. Kramer stated that it sounds like we are getting a little deeper in the hole when it comes to parking space per 200 square feet of building. Today, offices are technical and research, and a lot more people are in smaller offices. If the commission is comfortable with creating a problem, I guess I would support the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman states that there are no tenants identified. Part of the ownership group also owns the building to the north. They are looking at combining the sites. There are 48 extra spaces to the north and there are far more than that available. Building use in the proposed building would be comparable to the building to the north. He believed that parking would be sufficient.

Mr. Storrs stated that we ought to understand, however possible, what kind of parking problem they have, and how it compares to our ordinance.

Mr. Miller stated we should find out what the reason is and why.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, as requested for the Robbins Park Office Center, south of Maple Road and east of Stephenson Highway, Section 35, 2.5 acres, within the R-C Zoning District is hereby granted.

Yeas:

All Present (8)

Nays:

Absent:

Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

7. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-586) – American Polish Cultural Center Expansion, Northwest Corner of Maple and Dequindre, Section 25, B-1 & B-2

Mr. Miller stated that the Polish Cultural Center submitted a Site Plan to expand the existing Center. Subject property is located at the northwest corner of Maple Road and Dequindre Road and is 7.253 acres of size within the B-1 and B-2 Zoning Districts. The Planning Commission granted Site Plan Approval for an art center in 1984; then, in 1988, the Polish Cultural Center purchased the property and building. Currently, the Polish Cultural Center operates a restaurant, social club and offices within the existing building.

Mr. Miller further stated that the petitioner is proposing to split a 1.62 acre site from the original Polish Cultural Center property for the proposed Troy Professional Associates Office Building. A Site Plan Application for the proposed office building is being processed by the Planning Department; however, the petitioner is seeking parking and landscaped open space variances. Enclosed is a copy of the draft site plan for the Planning Commission's information.

Mr. Miller further stated that the existing building is 19,200 square feet and the proposed addition is 16,343 square feet in size with a building height of approximately 31.5 feet. There are three (3) use activities proposed within the building and include a social club, restaurant and offices. Parking requirements are then based upon the three activities that will occur within the building.

Mr. Miller further stated that there are no natural features located on the subject property. An existing fenced private stormwater detention basin is located on the subject property. Petitioner proposes to use this existing basin for stormwater detention. Planning Department site inspection determined the existing basin lacks high quality urban design aesthetics.

Mr. Miller further stated that the subject property contains a 24 feet wide cross-access and joint-drive easement located along the parcel that is being considered for office development. Access management principles dictate that consolidation of driveways provides additional safety for vehicular traffic on the public roads. The Planning Department discussed the provision of a joint driveway with the petitioner. Two factors, including the proposed development and existing recorded easement provides an optimal opportunity to use a joint driveway for the subject property and adjacent proposed office building.

Mr. Miller concluded stating that the proposed Site Plan meets the general Zoning Ordinance requirements regarding building location and parking lot requirements, although there are safety and aesthetic concerns. Therefore, the Planning Department recommends that the proposed site plan be tabled so the petitioner can coordinate the joint driveway easement with the adjacent proposed office

building and to design a stormwater detention basin with quality urban design aesthetics.

Ms. Pennington asked what kind of sprucing up are you looking at.

Mr. Miller stated that the fenced area presents a utilitarian use. Perhaps an enhanced landscaping area or relocation of the basin.

Mark Simpson, petitioner, stated that at this time he has nothing to add to Mr. Miller's comments. He did state that when this project was being reviewed by the Planning Department, it was mentioned that we are looking at a possible relocation of the detention basin.

Mr. Storrs stated he would like to see the joint driveway utilized. This is a perfect opportunity to coordinate these two sites.

Mr. Wright asked if we are only looking at the expansion of the existing building.

Mr. Miller stated this evening is only the expansion of the cultural center. Regarding the proposed office, we will need approval at a later meeting with the consideration of a joint driveway being provided.

Mr. Kramer stated that it looks like the facility will seat an approximate total of 1,000 people, is there any consideration for a loading dock.

Mr. Simpson, stated this is not an issue.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Storrs

Seconded by Reece

RESOLVED, that Preliminary Site Plan Approval, as requested for the Polish Cultural Center Expansion located at the northwest corner of Maple Road and Dequindre Road, 7.253 acres of size within the B-1 and B-2 Zoning Districts is hereby tabled to the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission to provide the opportunity to resolve joint driveway issues on these two sites and to improve the fencing for stormwater detention basin.

Yeas:  
All Present (8)

Nays:

Absent:  
Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

### **REZONING PROPOSAL**

8. **PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED REZONING (Z-679)** – Proposed Walnut Forest Condominium, East side of I-75, North of Paragon and South of the South end of Hedgewood Dr., Section 16 – R-1B to CR-1

Mr. Miller stated that D & T Construction Co. submitted a rezoning request from R-1B to CR-1, for 6.12 acres of land located east of I-75 and north of Paragon Street and south of the south end of Hedgewood Drive within Section 16.

Mr. Miller further stated that the subject property is currently vacant. The adjacent land uses include: single family residential to the north and south; vacant property owned by the Troy School District to the east; and state owned right-of-way and I-75 to the west.

Mr. Miller further stated that the current Future Land Use Plan designation for the subject property is Low Density Residential. The adjacent land use designations include: Low Density Residential to the north and south; an Elementary School site to the east; and Major Thoroughfare and Greenbelt Buffer to the west.

Mr. Miller further stated that the current zoning district classification of the subject property is R-1B One Family Residential. The adjacent zoning district classifications include: CR-1 One Family Cluster to the north; R-1B One Family Residential to the south, east and west.

Mr. Miller further stated that the Natural Features Map indicates woodlands and wetlands on the subject property. Aerial photography and site inspection confirms that considerable woodlands are present on the site. A wetlands determination would be necessary to identify the scope and location of any wetlands on the subject property. The City of Troy discussed the possible purchase of the Troy School District property located directly east of the rezoning request in an attempt to preserve properties with natural features. The School District indicated the desire to retain ownership of the property at this time. The subject property and the School District's property together include substantial woodlands and potential wetlands.

Mr. Miller further stated that Section 11.40.00 of the Zoning Ordinance provides location standards for the consideration of CR-1 Zoning Districts. There are three categories in the location standards and include transition basis, environmental basis and difficult parcel configuration basis. The subject property appears to qualify for each of these basis, although the natural features basis requires preservation of a minimum of five (5) acres. The property is six (6) acres in size; therefore, if developed, the five (5) acre minimum cannot be met.

Mr. Miller stated that the subject property is located adjacent to I-75 and what appears to be a highway beautification area. The Glens at Carlson Park, an existing CR-1 development, provides access via Hedgewood Drive stub to the northern boundary of the proposed rezoning. In addition, the narrowness of the property makes it impossible to develop in a typical double loaded street. The rezoning request is consistent with the Future Land Use Plan and compatible with the adjacent zoning districts and land uses. Based upon these findings, the Planning Department recommends approval of the CR-1 rezoning request.

Mr. Storrs stated that this zoning district allows attached houses, however, this doesn't mean they have to be detached.

Mr. Miller stated that we had a case similar that was approved about three months ago.

Ms. Pennington asked about road access to Paragon.

Mr. Miller stated that the configuration of the property provides a 60 foot width.

Mr. Kramer asked if zoning was changed to CR-1, it would just be site plan review.

Mr. Miller replied yes, for attached condominiums, while a plat or site condominium would require City Council approval.

Petitioner not present at the meeting.

Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Littman made a statement regarding public comments and that repeating the same concerns does not accomplish anything. If there is a spokesperson for all, it would be preferable.

Mr. Kramer asked if we have had any conversations with the school district and that we should call them.

Mr. Miller stated that Doug Smith of Real Estate and Development is the only person who has had conversations with the school district trying to find out if they would be willing to sell. Beyond that, there has been no other communication except for the public hearing notice.

Gordon Sheffield, 328 Paragon, stated he is a strong advocate of property rights for owners. However, there are several complex issues dealing with this parcel of land. He has been a resident of Troy and has lived on Paragon for 33 years. His

property is at the end of the street and was sold as single family. If the developer has the right of deed to develop this property, there are several concerns. The builder is changing the rules in the middle of the game. This project will take down the value of the property. Condominiums and apartments will make a mess like Southfield. We don't want cluster homes with dumpsters. Paragon residents will have to eat the traffic. Paragon residents are trying desperately to protect their environment and keep our residents safe.

Dan Gleeson, 238 Carter, stated that not only residents of Paragon being affected by traffic it will also affect Virgilia and Carter. We are trying to get some support to keep our City beautiful and keep our residents safe. With the future freeway ramp and the condominiums, there are going to be potential problems and we object to it. Traffic will be coming off these cluster homes.

Mr. Littman stated that he understands the street is an issue, however, we are only talking about rezoning at this moment.

Mr. Keoleian asked what other choices do we have than just putting a street through. There's not enough room to put a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Miller stated that what we are looking for is the appropriateness of this location for this zoning. In this zoning district you have houses that are permitted.

Gary Winters, 451 Carter, asked if they have to put the same amount of traffic back in that they took out. There is a water issue. They would run through our subdivision and enlarge our culvert. They are probably going to be tapping into the same basin.

Mr. Littman stated the issue we are dealing with presently is rezoning only. Something will be built on this property; however, that will be another meeting.

Mr. Winters stated it is not going to be easy for anyone.

Ron Bernard, 426 Paragon, stated that the majority of people who are here are concerned about the traffic. He is adjacent to these condominiums. One of the proposals made by Walnut Forest Condominiums was to have smaller lots. They would also put the size of lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 considerably smaller. These will almost be up to the lot line to my neighbors and myself.

Mr. Miller stated we are not regulating lot size, we are regulating density.

Mr. Littman stated that the minimum lot size in R-1B is 15,000 square feet.

Mr. Miller stated that the developer submits a schematic plan of what could happen with the rezoning application. They are also looking at attaching or not attaching the units.

Pat Kessler, 466 Paragon, stated that their property will be the most affected by this and questions what effect is there to their property value.

Mr. Littman stated your concern is the potential road.

Mrs. Kessler stated yes, and what about wildlife.

Mr. Littman stated that the owner has the right to develop and build. We understand your concern for wildlife. However, they can build within the current R-1B, One-Family Zoning District.

Charles Kessler, 427 Paragon, stated that the City of Troy has been working on managing wetlands. This looks like a good piece of property for the City to buy.

Mr. Littman asked if the City has already identified what parcels of land they are considering.

Mr. Miller stated they have already listed general areas.

Charles Lobbestael, 427 Paragon, stated that he realizes the developer can build houses there. Wetlands is an issue.

Mike Mares, 144 Paragon, asked if the developer could show a plan with R-1B.

Mr. Littman stated we cannot make contractual rezoning.

Ms. Lancaster stated that it would be illegal.

Mr. Kramer stated we should ask for an R-1B layout.

Mr. Littman agreed with Mr. Kramer.

Mr. Miller stated that the developer has some conceptualized plans. We will have them at the next meeting.

Kristine Gaunt, 316 Paragon, asked if the residents could be notified of the next hearing.

A resident asked how long this can be tabled by the petitioner by not showing up.

Mr. Wright stated, in general, that in 20 years of service in this community, that if a petitioner doesn't show up meeting after meeting, it doesn't go on for very long without a denial.

Ms. Lancaster stated that the Planning Commission can table as often as they would like.

Mr. Starr stated that the next meeting will be April 9, 2002.

Mr. Waller stated to the folks in the audience that his recommendation is that everyone sit down and write a letter to City Council and City Administration. Create an avalanche of letters. The election is coming up. That is the human factor. You have to make yourselves heard. I don't know how long ago a decision was made to start putting sidewalks in neighborhoods. The tragedy is that it happened in Troy. One of those things that we can't go back and change. The phenomena exists in Troy. It is not going to get any easier.

Mr. Storrs stated that in reading the intent of CR-1, I don't see how the rezoning request can meet the intent.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council that the public hearing and rezoning request for R-1B to CR-1, for 6.12 acres of land located east of I-75 and north of Paragon Street and south of the south end of Hedgewood Drive within Section 16, be continued to the next regular meeting of April 9, 2002.

Yeas:

Reece  
Littman  
Waller  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Starr

Nays:

Wright  
Storrs

Absent:

Chamberlain

## MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Wright stated there are no redeeming qualities.

## 9. ADJOURN



10. MEETING ADJOURNED 9:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller  
Planning Director